

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-18 are pending and rejected in the application.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Rourke et al., (hereinafter "O'Rourke"), U.S. 7,117,436 B1, in view of Alexander (hereinafter "Alexander"), U.S. 2004/0205528.

Applicants submit the cited references fails to teach or suggest at least a system for generating and communicating to web pages, comprising: a retrieved application handler being registered to an extracted template and an application handler to modify a template and to generate a part of said requested web page and incorporate that part into the template to form the web page (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

The Office Action asserts O'Rourke teaches the relevant limitations, citing Figs. 1-2 and column 6, lines 15-50. *See* Office Action dated 11/14/2007, page 6. Applicants disagree.

The first paragraph of the cited section of O'Rourke allegedly teaching the relevant limitations states:

FIG. 2 is a detail block diagram showing the system 10 for dynamically generating Web content of FIG. 1. The server 11 consists of three functional modules: template manager 21, HTT engine 22, and database engine 23. The template manager 21 maintains an HTT template repository 32 within the database 26. Each HTT template is a modified Web page initially written as an interpretable script in a tag-delimited page description language, such as HTML or XML. Markers are embedded into the script at locations where dynamic content will appear. The template manager 21 uploads the HTT templates into the HTT template repository 32.

This paragraph describes the structural components of the system 10 as described in O'Rourke. System 10 comprises a server comprising three modules: template manager 21, HTT engine 22, and database engine 23. Template manager 21 maintains a HTT template repository 32 by uploading HTT templates in the repository 32. It also describes the HTT templates as being

written in an interpretable script in a language such as HTML or XML that may further include markers.

Applicants submit the cited section does not describe at least a retrieved application handler to generate a part of said requested web page and incorporate that part into the template to form the web page (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). In particular, there is no description of a requested web page in the paragraph discussed above, and there is no description of an application handler generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page.

The second paragraph of the cited section states:

The HTT engine 22 generates dynamic Web pages 34 by substituting the markers embedded within the HTT templates with dynamic content according to controller programs 31. Each controller program 31 specifies a dynamic Web page to be generated as a series of commands, as further described below with reference to FIG. 4. In the described embodiment, each controller program 31 is written in either Java or Oracle PL/SQL. The controller program 31 invokes the HTT engine 22, specifies an HTT template, and makes substitution calls to the HTT engine 22. In the case of PL/SQL, each PL/SQL controller program 35 is stored in and is executed by the database 26. In the case of Java, a Java program, typically a Servlet, is invoked by a Servlet runner or application server (not shown) and the Servlet in turn invokes the HTT engine 22. The dynamic Web pages are generated as HTML, although other tag-delimited, page description languages could be used.

The second paragraph describes the HTT engine substituting markers embedded within the HTT templates with content according to controller programs 31. The controller program 31 specifies a dynamic web page to be generated by invokes the HTT engine 22, specifies an HTT template and makes substitution calls (the markers relating to the HTT templates, discussed above) to the HTT engine. It further describes the particular aspects of doing so in the PL/SQL context or Java context.

The cited section is largely directed the functionalities of the controller program 31 and the HTT engine 22, not the Office Action's alleged equivalent of the recited application handler, the template manager 21. *See id.* The template manager 21, the alleged equivalent, is not mentioned anywhere in this paragraph. Moreover, generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page is not discussed either. Therefore, Applicants submit the cited section fails to teach or suggest at least an application handler generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page.

The final paragraph of the cited section recites:

Finally, the database engine 23 interfaces to the database 26 and is used to maintain and execute queries on the database 26. In particular, the database engine 23 enables the HTT Engine 22 to combine dynamic data 33 stored in the database 26 with the HTT templates to generate the dynamic Web pages 34.

The cited section is directed to the database engine 23. It describes the database engine 23 interfacing with the database 26 and maintaining queries of database 26. The database engine 23 combines data already stored on the database 26 with the aforementioned HTT templates to generate web pages.

Similar to the section discussed above, the alleged equivalent of the recited application handler, the template manager 21, is not mentioned anywhere. Moreover, Applicants submit the cited section fails to teach or suggest at least an application handler generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page.

To make up for the deficiencies of these portions O'Rourke, the Office Action cites to the extensive section of column 2, line 60 – column 4, line 35, nearly the entire Summary of the Invention section. First, Applicants respectfully request that rather than a general citation, the

Application No.: 09/892,633

Amendment After Final dated: September 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 11, 2008

Office Action cite to specific portions of the O'Rourke reference (allegedly) corresponding to the specific limitations of the relevant claims. With respect to the general citation, we disagree that it describes the above-discussed limitations of, for example, claim 1. As discussed above, O'Rourke describes a system comprising a server comprising a template manager, a HTT engine, and database engine. The HTT templates may be written in an interpretable script in a language such as HTML or XML, and may further include markers placed anywhere in an HTML document. The markers are simple strings to indicate a relative position for dynamic content. For similar reasons to those described above, the newly cited section fails to teach or suggest at least an application handler generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page.

Alexander fails to make up for the deficiencies of O'Rourke. Alexander is directed to a system and process for managing content organized within a prepared template using metadata. For example, the Abstract describes a system and process for managing content organized in a tag-delimited template using metadata. A stored template written in a tag-delimited language is retrieved and a data entry form is built including individual data entry elements responsive to user selections on the user interface of the metadata form. *See also* paragraphs [0011]-[0013]. However, Applicants maintain the cited reference does not describe at least an application handler generating a part of a requested web page, and then incorporating that part into the template to form the web page (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

In order to support a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above, the cited references fail to support proper §103 rejections of independent claim 1. Therefore, the current

Application No.: 09/892,633

Amendment After Final dated: September 14, 2008

Reply to Office Action of July 11, 2008

rejection is lacking and should be withdrawn. Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable, and claims 7, 10, 13, and 16 are allowable for reasons similar as well. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, and 17-18 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7950 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: September 14, 2008

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/  
Sumit Bhattacharya  
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501